

**THE RACIST BIGOT JEW JUDGES WHO ILLEGALLY ENFORCE
RCW 13.34.115 AT THE REQUEST OF IT'S OWN SPIES, THE
GUARDIAN AD LITEM'S ARE IMPLEMENTING ADOLF HITLER'S
... "IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE CHILDREN" ...
NUREMBURG EXCUSE ... TO CONDUCT AN ILLEGAL SECRET
KIDNAPING HEARING IN DIRECT VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 1,
SECTION 10 OF THE WASHINGTON STATE CONSTITUTION
TO COVER UP THEIR PERJURY & ROUTINE SCRIPTED LIES!**

It is undisputed that all Parents have a right to demand that all family court hearings
"SHALL BE ADMINISTERED OPENLY" . . . pursuant to article 1, section 10 of the Washington
State Constitution which clearly reads:

**"SECTION 10 ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE. Justice in all cases shall be
administered openly, and without unnecessary delay." And;**

It is undisputed that only a Racist Bigot Jew Judge or his fellow Janissary Communist
Minded Judge would ever enforce Adolf Hitler's codification of . . . "the best interest of the child"
. . . Nuremburg Excuse to convene . . . "A SECRET KIDNAPING COURT" . . . as is clearly
provided by former RCW 13.04.090 now recodified at the current RCW 13.34.115 which reads:

**"RCW 13.34.115 Hearings — Public excluded when in the best interests of the child
— Notes and records — Video recordings.**

(1) All hearings shall be public, and conducted at any time or place within the limits of the
county, **except if the judge finds that excluding the public is in the best interests of the child.**

(2) Either parent, or the child's attorney or guardian ad litem, may move to close a hearing
at any time. **If the judge finds that it is in the best interests of the child the court shall exclude the
public.**

(3) If the public is excluded from the hearing, the following people may attend the closed
hearing **unless the judge finds it is not in the best interests of the child:**

(a) The child's relatives;

(b) The child's foster parents if the child resides in foster care; and

(c) Any person requested by the parent.

(4) Stenographic notes or any device which accurately records the proceedings may be
required as provided in other civil cases pursuant to RCW 2.32.200.

(5) Any video recording of the proceedings may be released pursuant to RCW 13.50.100,
however, the video recording may not be televised, broadcast, or further disseminated to the public."
See also State v. Bone-Club, 128 Wn.2d 254, 906 P.2d 325 (1995) and Seattle Times Co. v. Ishikawa,
97 Wn.2d 30, 640 P.2d 716 (1982). And;

It is undisputed pursuant to CR 8 (d) that the court's appointment of it's Spy, the Guardian

Ad Litem cannot be the basis for authorizing him or her to authorize a secret hearing, for to do so would have the effect of giving the court the power to appoint an “agent” with authority to remove the constitutional safeguards against secret kidnaping hearings . . . **“IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE CHILDREN”** . . . a phrase first coined by . . . **ADOLF HITLER.**

“What the Legislature is forbidden to do directly, certainly this court cannot do indirectly, a court not of record has only such powers as are given by statute. The City of Seattle v. Filson, 98 Wash.2d 66 (Nov. 1982). And;

“A flat prohibition against regulation of a matter in one direction does not give Congress power to regulate the matter in another direction.” Powe vs United States, 109 F.2d 140 (1940). And;

The secrecy of the kidnaping dependency proceedings and child stealing termination of parental rights hearings is intentionally done in bad faith and with unclean hands such as to deprive the parents and the children of their rights to due process and equal protection of the laws and mainly to cover up the Assistant Attorney General’s . . . **“ROUTINE SCRIPTED LIES.”**

In State v. Marsh, 126 Wash. 142 (1923), the court in reversing a conviction under the Juvenile Court Law because of a secret hearing having been had (without objection by the defendant) quoted from People v. Yeager, 113 Mich. 228, 71 N.W. 491, as follows:

“This constitutional provision was under consideration in the case of People v. Murray, 89 Mich. 276, 50 N.W. 995. In an elaborate opinion, Mr. Justice Champlin, referring to the case of People v. Kerrigan, 73 Cal. 223, 14 Pac. 849, the case relied upon by the prosecution here, made use of the following language: “I cannot accede to the correctness of the proposition in that case, that, if a public trial has not been accorded the accused, the burden is upon him to show that actual injury has been suffered by a deprivation of his constitutional right. On the contrary, when he shows that his constitutional right has been violated, the law conclusively presumes that he has suffered an actual injury. I go further, and say the whole body politic suffers an actual injury when a constitutional safeguard erected to protect the rights of citizens has been violated in the person of the humblest or meanest citizen of the state. The constitution does not stop to inquire of what the person has been accused, or what crime he has perpetrated; but it accords to all, without question, a fair, impartial, **and public trial.**” State v. Marsh, 126 Wash. 142 (1923). See former RCW 13.04.090. And;

If you want to sue your CPS Social Worker, Guardian Ad litem, Assistant Attorney General and Judge, please contact Luis Ewing at: 1 - (253) 226-3741 or e-mail me at:

<rcwcodebuster@aol.com> or <rcwcodebuster@yahoo.com> or go to: <http://www.luisewing.com>